1886MNRAS..47...68.

1886, Sept. 1.—Comet seen; only approximate position obtained.

Sept. 2.—Comet very faint as close to moon; a diffused coma, no decided nucleus.

Sept. 8.—Strong moonlight; comet much more condensed than on Sept. 2. Coma small, about $\frac{1}{4}'$ in diam.

Sept. 9.—Comet much brighter even with increased moonlight; a suspicion of a nucleus. Observed with a star not in catalogue.

Sept. 10.—Comet extremely faint, and difficult to observe owing to haze.

Sept. 14.—Comet brighter; a suspicion of a nucleus.

Sept. 15.—Comet much brighter; coma about 1′ in diam.

Sept. 20.—Comet brighter; condensed in the centre, with a very faint nucleus.

Sept. 21.—Comet bright, but no very distinct nucleus, but condensed in the centre. At $8^h\ 2^m\ 13^s$ S.M.T. the centre of the comet passed over a 9-mag. star. The star did not diminish in brightness, but appeared to have a slight haze round it. Three other 9-mag. stars in the field. A very faint nucleus was thought to be seen in glimpses; but if there at all it must be very faint.

Sept. 22.—Comet not so bright as last night. Difference of declination determined by the circle.

Sept. 24.—Night particularly bad; comet much fainter than it has been. A glimpse of a nucleus.

Sept. 25.—Evening very hazy; haze stopped further observations.

Sept. 28.—Comet faint; coma diffused, with a faint nucleus.

Sept. 29.—Comet fainter.

Telescope 11½-inch Equatorial, with filar micrometer.

Observations of Comet discovered by Finlay at the Cape, Sept. 26, 1886, made at Sydney Observatory with the 11½-inch Equatorial and filar micrometer.

(*Communicated by H. C. Russell, B.A., Government Astronomer.*)

Date. 1886.	Sydney M.T.	Star's Name.	Difference of Comet from Star. Comet—Star. R.A.	Comet—Star. N.P.D.	No. of Comp.
	h m s		m s	′ ″	
Sept. 30	10 0 53	9391 Cape Cat. '80	+1 45·7	− 7 44·51	1
Oct. 1	8 48 47	9391 Cape Cat. '80	+4 10·9	− 5 11·66	5
5	8 26 0	9504 Cape Cat. '80	+4 12·70	+13 40·92	6
11	9 17 49	9766 Cape Cat. '80	−7 51·28	− 7 52·87	4
12	8 2 21	9766 Cape Cat. '80	−4 57·38	− 6 59·78	10

Sept. 30.—Comet faint.

Oct. 5.—Moonlight; comet faint.

Oct. 7.—Comet observed with a star not in catalogue.

Downloaded from http://mnras.oxfordjournals.org/ at University of Georgia on June 13, 2015

© Royal Astronomical Society • Provided by the NASA Astrophysics Data System

1886MNRAS..47...68.

Oct. 8.—Comet brighter. At beginning of observations comet in a straight line with two 9-mag. stars. Change in R.A. during evening very apparent. Observed with a star not in catalogue.

Oct. 11.—Evening very hazy; comet very faint.

Oct. 12.—Comet faint.

On Evidence with respect to the Form of the Area in the Heavens from which the Meteors of November 27, 1885, appeared to Radiate. By A. C. Ranyard.

There were a great many observers of this rich shower, and most of them seem to agree that the meteors did not radiate from a point, but that there was a radiant area of some considerable extent. I did not observe the shower till well after its maximum at nearly nine o'clock; but from the forty or fifty meteors whose paths I observed, and was able to trace back upon the heavens (making a mental estimate of the distance of the radiant, judged from the length of the path and velocity), I thought that the area from which they radiated was elliptical, with its major axis nearly north and south, some 12° or 15° long, and a minor axis of 6° or 8°. I mentioned the elliptic shape of the area I had observed to Col. Tupman, and he told me that in the chart of paths he had laid down the radiant area was distinctly elliptical. But as I did not see any reason for such an elliptic form of the area, I regarded the coincidence as merely accidental, and thought that our results were probably not founded on a sufficient number of observed tracks. When Col. Tupman described his observations at the evening meeting of the Society, he stated that the longer axis of the elliptic area observed by him lay north and south. This struck me as an additional coincidence, for I felt sure that I had not mentioned to him the direction of the axes of the elliptic area observed by me; but I did not think seriously of the matter till a few weeks after, when I saw a letter from Prof. Young in *Nature* of December 17, in which, after describing his observations, he says that "the radiant was not a point but rather a region about 4° long north and south, and 2° wide." I then wrote to ask Prof. Young further about his observation, and he replied that the radiant region was "an oval area," perhaps a little larger than he had at first estimated.

Recently during a visit to the observatory at Nice, M. Perrotin showed me a map on which he and his assistants had laid down the courses of sixty or seventy meteors they had observed on the night of November 27. I at once saw that the paths did not radiate from a point, and without telling M. Perrotin of the other observations, I asked him to draw a contour line round the area of radiation. Both he and M. Thollon, who was present, drew elliptic curves with the longer axis north and south, or rather inclined 10° or 15° to the west of the north point.

Downloaded from http://mnras.oxfordjournals.org/ at University of Georgia on June 13, 2015

© Royal Astronomical Society • Provided by the NASA Astrophysics Data System